

REMARKS

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 11, 19, 21, and 29 are amended herein. No new matter is added as a result of the Claim amendments.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Matsukane et al. (US 5,467,341) hereinafter referred to as "Matsukane." The Applicant have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in amended Claims 1-30 are not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Matsukane. For example, Claim 1 recites (emphasis added):

receiving said wireless signal at a wireless receiver of said radio frequency peripheral component card;
demodulating said wireless signal;
determining an error rate of a digital data portion of said wireless signal; and
indicating a quality level of reception of said wireless signal at said radio frequency peripheral component card based on said error rate using an indicator component of said radio frequency peripheral component card.

Claims 11 and 21 recite similar claim limitations. The Applicant respectfully submits that Matsukane teaches away from the claim limitation of indicating a quality level of reception at the radio frequency peripheral component card as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 21 of the present invention. The Applicant understands Matsukane to teach that Link Quality Test packets are sent from the mobile stations to the server to evaluate the quality of the transmission link between the transmitting mobile station and the server. The server then determines whether the data packets (e.g., the Link Quality Test packets) were received without error.

(column 5, line 44- column 6, line 4). The mobile stations then determine the communication quality statistics based upon the number of packet acknowledgements received from the server. If an acknowledgement for a given packet is not received within a predetermined time interval, the packet is re-transmitted to the server (column 7, lines 5-26). Matsukane then teaches (column 8, lines 22-37) that the link quality is determined as a function of the number of packet re-transmissions to the server which occur. The Applicant respectfully asserts that the system taught by Matsukane does not indicate the quality level of reception at the radio frequency peripheral component card as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 21 of the present invention, but instead indicates the quality level of reception at the server. This is in contrast to the teaching of the present invention in which error calculation block 226 evaluates a digital data signal received by the radio frequency peripheral component card and provides an error rate (page 13, line 21 - page 14, line 9).

The Applicant further submit that the above recited claim limitation of an indicator component of a radio frequency peripheral component card is neither taught nor suggested by Matsukane. Instead, the Applicant respectfully submits that Matsukane teaches away from the above recited claim limitation in Figures 6 and 7. The Applicant understands Matsukane to show a communication adapter in Figure 6. However, this adapter clearly does not teach or suggest the existence of any type of indicator which is a component of the communication adapter. Instead, the Applicant understands Matsukane showing an indicator (e.g., 705) as a component of the mobile station, but not a component of a radio frequency peripheral component card as recited in Claims 1, 11, and 21 of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 1, 11, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are overcome.

Claims 2-10 depend from Claim 1 and recite additional claim limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 2-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are also overcome.

Claims 12-20 depend from Claim 11 and recite additional claim limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 12-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are also overcome.

Claims 22-30 depend from Claim 21 and recite additional claim limitations descriptive of embodiments of the present invention. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of Claims 22-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) are also overcome.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, the Applicant respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected Claims.

Based on the arguments presented above, the Applicant respectfully assert that Claims 1-30 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, the Applicant respectfully solicit allowance of these Claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Date:

9/30/05

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

John P. Wagner Jr.
Reg. No. 35, 398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060